

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 Anthony Miles,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 Calvin Johnson, et al.,

10 Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-00087-GMN-DJA

Order

11 Before the Court is Defendants Calvin Johnson, Julie Williams, Michael Minev, James
12 Scally, and Telwin Slack's motion to reopen discovery and to extend the dispositive motion
13 deadline for sixty days. (ECF No. 50). Defendants explain that, after the close of discovery,
14 Plaintiff moved to amend his complaint, in which amendment Plaintiff added two new
15 defendants. Defendants move to reopen discovery so that they can conduct discovery related to
16 Plaintiff's amended complaint. Plaintiff did not respond to the motion, constituting his consent to
17 the Court granting it. *See* LR 7-2(d). And the Court finds that Defendants have shown good
18 cause and excusable neglect sufficient to reopen and extend these deadlines. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P.
19 16(b)(4); *see* LR 26-3. So, the Court grants the motion.

20 This matter is also before the Court on its review of the docket. In the parties' prior
21 stipulation to extend time, the Attorney General's Office indicated that it would submit an
22 acceptance of service for the new defendants. (ECF No. 47 at 2). The Attorney General's Office
23 has not yet done so. So, the Court will order that the amended complaint be served on the
24 Attorney General's Office so that it may indicate whether it accepts service for the new
25 defendants.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants' motion to extend discovery (ECF No. 50) is **granted**. The following deadlines shall govern discovery:

Close of discovery: May 26, 2025

Dispositive motions: June 24, 2025

Joint pretrial order: July 24, 2025¹

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is kindly directed to electronically serve a copy of this order and Plaintiff's amended complaint (ECF No. 49) on the Office of the Attorney General of the State of Nevada. This does not indicate acceptance of service for Jay Barth and Paul Araujo.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that service on Barth and Araujo must be perfected on or before **July 14, 2025**, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that on or before **May 5, 2025**, the Attorney General's Office shall file a notice advising the Court and Plaintiff whether it accepts service for Barth and/or Araujo. If the Attorney General's Office does not accept service for Barth and/or Araujo, the Attorney General's Office must file Barth and/or Araujo's last known addresses under seal and indicate that it has filed this information under seal in its notice. If Barth and/or Araujo's last known addresses are a post office box, the Attorney General's Office shall attempt to obtain and provide the last known physical address.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if the Attorney General's Office cannot accept service for Barth and/or Araujo, Plaintiff shall file a motion requesting issuance of summons for Barth and/or Araujo. If the Attorney General's Office has not provided a last-known-address for Barth and/or Araujo, Plaintiff shall provide Barth and/or Araujo's full name and address in his motion.

¹ Under Local Rule 26-1(b)(5), if dispositive motions are filed, the deadline for filing the joint pretrial order will be suspended until thirty days after decision on the dispositive motions or further court order.

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that if the Attorney General's Office accepts service of
2 process for Barth and/or Araujo, Barth and/or Araujo shall file and serve an answer or other
3 response to the complaint on or before **May 12, 2025**.

4
5 DATED: April 14, 2025

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'D. Albrechts', is written above a horizontal line.

DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE